

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 39, 42-44, 50, and 52-56 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 22, 39, 50, 54, and 56 are currently amended.

No new claims are added.

No claims are canceled in this response.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 39, 42-44, 50, and 52-56 are pending.

Rejection of the Claims

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 50, and 52-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,887,145 to Harari in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884 to Dedrick.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added by the amendment. The amendment is not meant to narrow the scope of claim 1, but to add clarity.

Claim 1 as amended defines an assembly: for physically transporting a user profile between network and standalone computing devices; for automatically

logging onto one of the network or standalone computing devices; and for automatically configuring the logged-on network or standalone computing device with user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics according to the user profile; that includes:

a portable profile storage device having an interface to communicate with a physical key and having a secure memory to securely store the user profile; and

a removable passcode-activated physical key associated with the user that alternately enables access to the user profile in the memory when the physical key is passcode-activated and coupled with the interface and that disables access to the user profile when removed from the interface,

wherein the portable profile storage device makes the user profile accessible to a computing device if the portable profile storage device is coupled with the computing device, the physical key is coupled with the interface, and a user passcode activates the physical key; and

wherein the physical key first authenticates the user, then authenticates the portable profile storage device, then automatically logs the user onto the computing device, then automatically configures the computing device with the user-preferences and the user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

The Harari reference and the Dedrick reference, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of Claim 1. For example, in the Office Action being responded to, the Office points out that Harari fails to teach or suggest a passcode-activated physical key and Dedrick does not disclose a login process. Further, neither Harari nor Dedrick teach or suggest a physical key that can be unlocked with a passcode, and when unlocked proceeds to: authenticate the portable profile storage device; and then automatically log the user onto the computing device; and then automatically configure the computing device with the

user-preferences and the user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Thus, since the Harari and Dedrick references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least some elements of Claim 1, the combination fails and Applicant suggests that claim 1 should be allowable.

Claims 4 and 6

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 6 are patentable over the Harari and Dedrick references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 4 and 6 should also be allowable.

Claim 22

Claim 22 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added by the amendment. The amendment is not meant to narrow the scope of claim 22, but to add clarity.

Claim 22, as amended, defines a computer system that stores user credentials, user-preferences, and user-selected operating system characteristics in a portable "smart card secured" memory assembly that can automatically log the user onto various network and standalone computing devices and automatically configure the logged on computing device with the user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile, including:

a computer having a portable device reader; and
a smart card secured memory assembly to compatibly interface with the portable device reader in the computer, the smart card secured memory assembly having data memory to store a user profile and a passcode-protected removable smart card that alternately enables access to the user profile when present and activated via the passcode and that disables access to the user profile when removed,

wherein the smart card first authenticates the user, then authenticates the user profile, then automatically logs the user onto the computer, then automatically configures the computer with the user-preferences and the user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Similar to the remarks for Claim 1 above, the Harari and Dedrick references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of Claim 22. For example, neither Harari nor Dedrick teach or suggest a passcode-protected smart card that can be unlocked with a passcode, that then proceeds to authenticate the user profile, automatically log the user onto the computer, and automatically configure the computer with the user-preferences and the user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Thus, since the Harari and Dedrick references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least some elements of Claim 22, the combination fails and Applicant suggests that claim 22 should be allowable.

Claims 23-26

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22, Applicant submits that claims 23-26 are patentable over the Harari and Dedrick references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend.

Claims 23-26 depend from claim 22. Therefore, claims 23-26 should also be allowable.

Claim 50

Claim 50 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added by the amendment. The amendment is not meant to narrow the scope of claim 50, but to add clarity.

Claim 50, as amended, defines a personal information carry on assembly for physically transporting a profile of a computing device user between a computing network and a standalone computing device that includes:

- removable means for storing data files;
- an interface on the removable means for communicatively coupling and uncoupling with the computing network or the standalone computing device; and

- detachable means for enabling passcode-protected access to data files on the removable means when the detachable means communicatively attaches to the removable means,

- wherein the removable means includes a flash memory, and the data files include a user profile to configure the computing network and the standalone computing device, and

- wherein the detachable means first authenticates the user, then authenticates the removable means, then automatically logs the user onto the computing device, then automatically configures the computing device with user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Similar to the remarks for Claim 1 above, the Harari and Dedrick references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of Claim 50. For example, neither Harari nor Dedrick teach or suggest a passcode-

protected detachable means that can be activated with a passcode and when activated then proceeds to authenticate the user profile, automatically log the user onto the computer, and automatically configure the computer with user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Thus, since the Harari and Dedrick references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least some elements of Claim 50, the combination fails and Applicant suggests that claim 50 should be allowable.

Claims 52 and 53

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 50, Applicant submits that claims 52 and 53 are patentable over the Harari and Dedrick references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 52 and 53 depend from claim 50. Therefore, claims 52 and 53 should also be allowable.

Claim 54

Claim 54 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added by the amendment. The amendment is not meant to narrow the scope of claim 54, but to add clarity.

Claim 54, as amended, defines a secure apparatus for physically transporting a profile of a computing device user between computing devices that includes:

a first portable storage device, including:
a storage area for storing the profile and for storing a public key of an encryption key pair,
a first interface for communicatively coupling with one of the computing devices, and
a second interface;
a second portable storage device capable of coupling with the second interface, including:
a storage area for a private key of the encryption key pair, and
an authentication device for verifying a passcode from the user;
wherein the secure apparatus uploads the profile to a computing device in response to: the computing device being communicatively coupled with the secure apparatus, the private key complementing the public key, and the authentication device verifying the passcode received from the user, and
wherein the second portable storage device authenticates the user, then authenticates the first portable storage device, then automatically logs the user onto one of the computing devices, then automatically configures the logged on computing device with user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics from the profile.

Similar to the remarks for Claim 1 above, the Harari and Dedrick references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of Claim 54. For example, neither Harari nor Dedrick teach or suggest a "second portable storage device" with an authentication device to verify a user passcode, that after verification of the passcode then authenticates a first portable storage device storing a user profile, automatically logs the user onto a computing device, and automatically configures the computing device with user-preferences and user-selected operating system characteristics from the user profile.

Thus, since the Harari and Dedrick references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least some elements of Claim 54, the combination fails and Applicant suggests that claim 54 should be allowable.

Claims 55 and 56

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 54, Applicant submits that claims 55 and 56 are patentable over the Harari and Dedrick references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 54. Therefore, claims 55 and 56 should also be allowable.

Claims 39 and 42-44

Claims 39 and 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Harari reference in view of the Dedrick reference and U.S. Patent No. 6,148,354 to Ban et al. ("Ban").

It should be noted that Applicant has established invention of the subject matter of the presently rejected claims prior to the April 5, 1999 filing date of Ban, in a Rule 131 Declaration filed with a previous response to an Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) may be improper.

Separately from the above consideration of whether Ban is a viable reference, Applicant has changed Claim 39 to be a dependent claim of Claim 22. This change in dependency is merely to streamline prosecution and bring the case to allowance.

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22, Applicant submits that claims 39 and 42-46 are patentable over the Harari, Dedrick, and Ban, references either singly or in combination. Dependent claims contain the language


of the claims from which they depend. Claims 39 and 42-46 depend from claim 22. Therefore, claims 39 and 42-46 should also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully suggests that pending claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 39, 42-44, 50, and 52-56 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9-8-05

By: 
Lee & Hayes PLLC
Mark C. Farrell
Reg. No. 45,988
(509) 324-9256 ext 243